

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,987	09/12/2003	Fumiya Ohmi	62301-Z CCD	6094
7590 01/22/2007 Christopher C. Dunham			EXAMINER	
c/o Cooper & Dunham LLP 1185 Ave. of the Americas New York, NY 10036			PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2627	•
				•
SHORTENED STATUTORY PE	RIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/22/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/660,987	OHMI, FUMIYA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Aristotelis M. Psitos	2627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION	L				
If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	cause the application to become ABANDONEI	D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 No	ovember 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-11</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-11</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	a.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/660,987

Art Unit: 2627

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/10 & 10/2 2006 has been entered.

Drawings

The substitute drawing filed on 2/14/06 is greatly appreciated and has been entered.

It has been interpreted as the "substitute" drawing required under 37 CFR 1.81 (c).

Specification

The new title of the invention is greatly appreciated and has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As amended, claim 9 now recites in the ultimate paragraph the phrase " ... and is a fraction of,...".

However, such a phrase finds no support in the specification as required by 37 CFR 1.75 (d) (1).

With respect to newly introduced claim 11, this fails to further limit the parent claim, i.e., if the lower recording power for formatting is a "fraction" of the recording power calculated during the calibration step, how is "1" a fraction thereof? The examiner does not interpret the value "1" to be a "fraction of".

Appropriate corrections are required.

Applicant is cautioned against the entry of any NEW MATTER.

In response to applicants' arguments with respect to the 101 issue raised in the previous OA, the examiner no longer maintains such. The claims are drawn to the disclosure focusing upon the format capability and not to the overwrite problem. Hence the claims do not/are not attempting to define a formatting process in various different drive devices, i.e., reformatting/overwriting.

If the above analysis/conclusion is incorrect, then further clarification from applicants is respectfully required.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,987 Page 3

Art Unit: 2627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 9,10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 8-77633 considered with Nakao et al and further or alternatively the JP document considered with Kubota et al ('747).

JP 8-77633 (see the MAT (machine assisted translation of such), discloses a formatting system for optical discs in which the power level relied upon for formatting is less than that used for recording – see the MAT starting at paragraph 8.

There is no depiction of any calibration of the recording power.

Nakao et al, discloses in this environment, a calibration capability/process to optimize the system

see the entire description.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of JP 9-77633 with the above teaching from Nakao et al, motivation is to optimize the recording power value.

Alternatively, Kubota et al – see the description starting with the disclosure of figure 17 plus (9th embodiment), teaches in this environment, the ability of variable setting the power values to ensure proper overwriting. The examiner interprets such as the power calibration step of the independent step.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of Jp 8-77633 with the above teaching from Kubota et al, motivation is to optimize the power level.

With respect to claim 10, this is interpreted as a product by process step. Such is met.

With respect to claim 11, the examiner interprets the phrase "fraction" as that not including "1".

Since the base JP reference indicates that the power is "less than" the recording power, the less than limit is considered met.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M. Psitos whose telephone number is (571) 272-7594. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Dwayne D. Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where
this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aristotelis M Psitos Primary Examiner Art Unit 2627